REMARKS

Amendments to the claims:

Claims 1, 5-7 and 24 have been canceled.

Each of claims 3 and 4 has been amended to depend from new claim 25, and has also been amended for consistency of language and the like in view of the change in dependency.

Claim 8 has been amended to add new limitations. Support for the amendments to claim 8 are found at least in the specification at page 9, line 30 through page 11, line 32, and in Fig. 5.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from new claim 30, and has also been amended for consistency of language and the like in view of the change in dependency.

Each of claims 13 and 14 have been amended for consistency of language and the like in view of the change in dependency of claim 12.

Claim 15 has been amended to add new limitations. Support for the amendments to claim 15 are found at least in the specification at page 9, line 30 through page 11, line 32, and in Fig. 5.

Each of claims 19-22 has been amended for consistency of language and the like in view of the amendments to claim 15.

Claim 23 has been amended to add new limitations. Support for the amendments to claim 23 are found at least in the specification at page 9, line 30 through page 11, line 32, and in Fig. 5.

Claims 25-33 have been added. Support for new claims 25-33 is found at least in the original claims as well as in the specification at page 9, line 30 through page 11, line 32, and in Fig. 5.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of the amendments.

Claim Objections:

Claim 12 been objected to because the word "should" in line 3 of that claim renders the scope of the claim indefinite. The Examiner has recommended changing the word "should" to the word "is" in order to overcome the objection.

The Applicant has incorporated the Examiner's recommendation by amending claim 12 to change the word "should" to the word "is."

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the objection to claim 12 has been overcome, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,724,496 B1 to McIntyre.

Claims 8, 10, 15, 19, 20 and 22-24 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,091,507 to Vatland.

Claims 1 and 24 have each been canceled, and the rejections of those claims are therefore moot.

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to now depend from new claim 25. The Applicant contends that claims 3 and 4 are allowable at least for the reasons that claim 25 is allowable, as set forth herein below.

The Applicant notes that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference and that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. (MPEP 2131.)

Claim 8 has been amended to now include the following elements:

> *a processor with software configured to receive an unrasterized version of a print job and, in response, retrieve a rasterized version of the print job from a storage device external to said image producing device*.

Neither Vatland nor McIntyre expressly or inherently describes all of the elements of amended claim 8. In other words, neither Vatland nor McIntyre shows the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 8, as amended.

Rather, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, neither Vatland nor McIntyre anticipates claim 8, as amended, because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of amended claim 8, nor

do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in amended claim 8, as is required for anticipation.

More specifically, neither Vatland nor McIntyre teach or suggest a processor with software configured to receive an unrasterized version of a print job and, in response, retrieve a rasterized version of the print job from a storage device external to said image producing device, as is required by Applicant's claim 8.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn and that claim 8, as amended, be allowed.

Claim 15 has been amended to now include the following elements:

> *receiving, for a first time, an unrasterized print job from a device on a network;*
>
> *processing said unrasterized print job into a rasterized print job;*
>
> *sending the rasterized print job to an external storage device;*
>
> *retrieving, for a first time, the rasterized print job from the external storage device;*
>
> *receiving, for a second time, the unrasterized print job;*
>
> *retrieving, for a second time, the rasterized print job from the external storage device;*
>
> *generating an image from said rasterized print job using an image producing device*.

Neither Vatland nor McIntyre expressly or inherently describe all of the elements of amended claim 15. In other words, neither Vatland nor McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 15, as amended.

Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, neither Vatland nor McIntyre anticipates claim 15 because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of amended claim 15, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is

contained in amended claim 15, as is required for anticipation. More specifically, neither Vatland or McIntyre teach or suggest:

1) receiving, for a first time, an unrasterized print job from a device on a network;

2) processing said unrasterized print job into a rasterized print job;

3) sending the rasterized print job to an external storage device;

4) retrieving, for a first time, the rasterized print job from the external storage device;

5) receiving, for a second time, the unrasterized print job;

6) retrieving, for a second time, the rasterized print job from the external storage device; and

7) generating an image from said rasterized print job using an image producing device,

-- all of which are required by Applicant's claim 15.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and that claim 15, as amended, be allowed.

Claim 23 has been amended to now include the following elements:

> *means for printing including means for rasterizing a print job to produce a rasterized version of said print job;*
>
> *means for transmitting, in response to rasterizing, said rasterized version of said print job externally of said means for printing;*
>
> *means for storing, in response to transmitting, said rasterized version of said print job externally of said means for printing;*
>
> *means for receiving a request to print said print job; and*
>
> *means for retrieving, in response to receiving said request, said rasterized version of said print job back to said means for printing*.

Neither Vatland nor McIntyre expressly or inherently describe all of the elements of amended claim 23. In other words, neither Vatland nor McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 23, as amended.

Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image

processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, neither Vatland nor McIntyre anticipates claim 23 because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of amended claim 23, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in amended claim 23, as is required for anticipation. More specifically, neither Vatland or McIntyre teach or suggest:

1) means for printing including means for rasterizing a print job to produce a rasterized version of said print job;

2) means for transmitting, in response to rasterizing, said rasterized version of said print job externally of said means for printing;

3) means for storing, in response to transmitting, said rasterized version of said print job externally of said means for printing;

4) means for receiving a request to print said print job; and

5) means for retrieving, in response to receiving said request, said rasterized version of said print job back to said means for printing,

-- all of which are required by Applicant's claim 23.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and that claim 23, as amended, be allowed.

Inasmuch as claim 10 depends from claim 8 and therefore contains all the elements of claim 8, it is axiomatic that claim 10 is not anticipated by either Vatland or McIntyre for at least the reasons that claim 8 is not anticipated, as set forth herein above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn and that claim 10 be allowed.

Similarly, inasmuch as each of claims 19, 20 and 22 depends from claim 15 and therefore contains all the elements of claim 15, it is axiomatic that each of claims 19, 20 and 22 is not anticipated by either Vatland or McIntyre for at least the reasons that claim 15 is not anticipated, as set forth herein above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of each of claims 19, 20 and 22 be withdrawn and that those claims be allowed.

(Continued on next page.)

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre in view of Vatland.

Claims 11-14 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vatland in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,563 B1 to Barry.

Claims 5-7 have been canceled, and the rejections of those claims are therefore moot.

Inasmuch as claim 11 depends from claim 8, which is allowable at least for the reasons set forth herein above, it is axiomatic that claim 11 is also allowable for at least the reasons that claim 8 is allowable. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn and that claim 11 be allowed.

As the result of amendments to claim 12, each of claims 12-14 now depends from newly added claim 30. Accordingly, the Applicant contends that each of claims 12-14 is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 30 is allowable, as is set forth herein below. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 12-14 be withdrawn and that claims 12-14 be allowed.

Inasmuch as claim 21 depends from claim 15, which is allowable at least for the reasons set forth herein above, it is axiomatic that claim 21 is also allowable for at least the reasons that claim 15 is allowable. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn and that claim 21 be allowed.

New Claims:

The Applicant has added new claims 25-33. The Applicant contends that these new claims are not anticipated by, or obvious over, the prior art at least because the prior art does not teach or suggest all the limitations of each of these new claims.

Specifically, each of new claims 25 and 26, as well as each of claims 3 and 4, contains the following elements:

a storage device in communication with a network; and

a server in communication with the network, the server configured to:

receive an unrasterized version of a given print job from the network; and

in response to receiving the print job, search the storage device to determine whether a rasterized version of the given print job is stored on the storage device.

The Applicant contends that none of the prior art references teach or suggest all these elements required by new claims 25 and 26 and dependent claims 3 and 4. Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, none of claims 3, 4, 25 and 26 is anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Vatland and/or McIntyre because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of claims 3, 4, 25 and 26, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claims 3, 4, 25 and 26.

Specifically, none of the prior art references teach or suggest:

1) a storage device in communication with a network; and

2) a server in communication with the network, the server configured to receive an unrasterized version of a given print job from the network, and in response to receiving the print job, search the storage device to determine whether a rasterized version of the given print job is stored on the storage device,

--all as required by each of claims 3, 4, 25 and 26.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn and that claims 3, 4, 25 and 26 be allowed.

Each of new claims 27-29 contains the following elements:

means for receiving an unrasterized version of a print job from a network;

means for determining whether a rasterized version of the print job is stored on a storage means connected to the network;

means for retrieving the rasterized version of the print job from the storage means in response to determining that the rasterized version is stored;

means for converting the unrasterized print job into rasterized format in response to determining that no rasterized version is stored; and

means for sending the rasterized print job to a means for printing an image from the rasterized print job.

The Applicant contends that none of the prior art references teach or suggest all these elements required by claims 27-29. Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, none of claims 27-29 is anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Vatland and/or McIntyre because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of claims 27-29, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claims 27-29. Specifically, none of the prior art references teach or suggest:

1) means for receiving an unrasterized version of a print job from a network;

2) means for determining whether a rasterized version of the print job is stored on a storage means connected to the network;

3) means for retrieving the rasterized version of the print job from the storage means in response to determining that the rasterized version is stored;

4) means for converting the unrasterized print job into rasterized format in response to determining that no rasterized version is stored; and

5) means for sending the rasterized print job to a means for printing an image from the rasterized print job,

-- all of which are required by each of claims 27-29.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that claims 27-29 be allowed.

Each of new claims 30-32, as well as each of dependent claims 12-14 (based upon their dependence from new independent claim 30), contains the following elements:

receiving an unrasterized version of a print job;

in response to receiving, determining whether a rasterized version of the print job is stored on a storage device;

retrieving the rasterized version of the print job from the storage device in response to determining that the rasterized version is stored;

converting the unrasterized print job into rasterized format in response to determining that no rasterized version is stored; and

printing an image from the rasterized print job.

The Applicant contends that none of the prior art references teach or suggest all these elements required by claims 12-14 and 30-32. Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, none of claims 12-14 and 30-32 is anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Vatland and/or McIntyre because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of claims 12-14 and 30-32, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claims 12-14 and 30-32. Specifically, none of the prior art references teach or suggest:

1) receiving an unrasterized version of a print job;

2) in response to receiving, determining whether a rasterized version of the print job is stored on a storage device;

3) retrieving the rasterized version of the print job from the storage device in response to determining that the rasterized version is stored;

4) converting the unrasterized print job into rasterized format in response to determining that no rasterized version is stored; and

5) printing an image from the rasterized print job,

-- all of which are required by each of claims 12-14 and 30-32.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 12-14 be withdrawn and that claims 12-14 and 30-32 be allowed.

New claim 33 contains the following elements:

a network;

a storage device in communication with the network;

a first processor in communication with the network and configured to:

generate an unrasterized version of a print job; and

transmit the unrasterized version of the print job over the network; and

a second processor in communication with the network and configured to:

receive the unrasterized version of the print job from the network; and

in response to receiving the unrasterized version of the print job, determine whether a rasterized version of the print job is available on the storage device.

The Applicant contends that none of the prior art references teach or suggest all these elements required by claim 33. Rather, as is described above, Vatland discloses means facilitating high speed transmission of raster data from a host computer having a raster image processor to a printer, while McIntyre discloses means of converting a print job containing PDL into a raster image and then printing the raster image.

Thus, claim 33 is not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Vatland and/or McIntyre because neither Vatland nor McIntyre describes all of the elements of claim 33, nor do either Vatland or McIntyre show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 33. Specifically, none of the prior art references teach or suggest:

1) a network;

2) a storage device in communication with the network;

3) a first processor in communication with the network and configured to generate an unrasterized version of a print job, and transmit the unrasterized version of the print job over the network;

and

4) a second processor in communication with the network and configured to receive the unrasterized version of the print job from the network, and in response to receiving the unrasterized version of the print job, determine whether a rasterized version of the print job is available on the storage device,

-- all of which are required by each of claim 33.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that claim 33 be allowed.

Summary

The Applicant believes this response/amendment constitutes a full and complete reply to the office action mailed 05/29/2007. The Applicant respectfully requests timely allowance of claims 3, 4, 8, 10-15, 19-23 and 25-33.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the below-signed attorney if the Examiner believes this will facilitate prosecution toward allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Todd A. LUTZ

Date: July 27, 2007

By _____
John S. Reid
Attorney and agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,369
Phone: (509) 534-5789